

## Pali, Pāṇini and “Popular” Sanskrit\*

(Miscellanea Palica VI)

Though it has never been doubted that non-standard Sanskrit (or *sanskrit approximatif*, as Helmer Smith [1954: 3] called it) as evidenced by the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas is of prime importance for the study of the history of Pali and other Middle Indo-Aryan languages, the Pali grammar of Geiger – and the same holds true for the Prakrit grammar of Pischel – does not make any reference to Epic or Purāṇic Sanskrit forms. Just as little attention has been paid to the relation of Pali (and Middle Indo-Aryan in general) to late Vedic and Sanskrit as described by Pāṇini. On the other hand, scholars discussing specific forms and constructions of late Vedic, of Epic and Purāṇic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini's grammar have rarely taken into account corresponding Middle Indian phenomena. A few selected examples – in the main syntactical and lexical problems – will be discussed to show that the interlinking of the linguistic study of Pali, of Epic and Purāṇic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini will not only help us to achieve a better understanding of the development of the Indo-Aryan languages, but will also prove fruitful for the better comprehending of what the texts actually tell us.

---

\* The author wishes to express his gratitude to the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* for granting a *Heisenberg-Stipendium*. This enabled him to write this paper, which is the outcome of an extensive investigation of Epic Sanskrit, the results of which will be published as a “Grammar of Epic Sanskrit” (in *Indian Philology and South Asian Studies* [ed. by A. Wezler and M. Witzel]). My thanks are also due to Professor O. von Hinüber, who read an earlier version of this paper and made valuable suggestions. Needless to say, I am responsible for any faults this article may contain.

I use the abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts laid down in the *Epilegomena* to Volume I of *A Critical Pali Dictionary*.

## 1.1. Instrumental in place of locative

One syntactical feature shared by Pali, Prakrit and non-standard Sanskrit is the usage of the instrumental<sup>1</sup> in place of the locative<sup>2</sup>. It will be seen that the consideration of the same phenomenon in Epic Sanskrit on the one hand, and in Prakrit on the other, will help us to assess one of Lüders' hypotheses relating to the "eastern" proto-canonical Buddhist language. Lüders postulated a locative in °*ehi* for the "eastern" language, since a couple of Pali stanzas use a form in °*ehi* where we would expect a locative (1954: § 220-225; cf. von Hinüber § 321)<sup>3</sup>. But it is well known that, in the syntax of Epic Sanskrit, the salient feature is the interchangeability of different cases in construction with verb forms. This "confusion" of cases was due to the incipient break-down of the inflexional system, which again led to the employment of a large number of post-positions. The same phenomenon is encountered in Middle Indo-Aryan where – e.g. in the feminine noun inflection (cf. Insler 1994: 70) –

<sup>1</sup> I regret that I do not have access to Sukumar Sen, "The use of the instrumental in Middle Indo-Aryan", PAIOC V (Summaries) 44-48 (according to the PAIOC index it has been published in *Indian Linguistics* 8 – however, it is not to be found there).

<sup>2</sup> Due to my regrettable ignorance of any Dravidian language I do not know whether (or not) and (if so) to what extent such a phenomenon is due to the influence of Dravidian. To judge from the investigations of De Vreese (1953, 1980), "Dravidisms" in Pali only appear rather late.

<sup>3</sup> In the report on his investigations into the Buddhist "Urkanon", originally published in SBAW 1927, p. 123, and reprinted in Lüders 1954: 8, Lüders explicitly speaks of the "Lok. pl. auf -*ehi*" (cf. also von Hinüber 1968: § 307). And he considers this form as a *peculiarity of the nominal inflexion* of the "Ostsprache" and *not* of the syntax of that language: "Auch in der Flexion zeigen sich manche Unterschiede. Wichtig ist besonders, daß der Akk. Pl. der *a*-Stämme auf -*am* ausging, der Lok. pl. auf -*ehi*" (l.c.). Lüders' reasoning, in establishing this ending, is as simple as it is in the case of the "ablative" in °*am* (cf. de Vreese 1955: 370): some verbs are normally construed with the locative; if we find a form in °*ehi* in one of these constructions it has to be a locative; and because we do find it we have a locative in °*ehi*.

the paradigms were reduced to an opposition between *casus rectus* (nom. and acc.) and *casus obliquus*. Thus, in all kinds of non-standard Sanskrit, the instrumental can be used where we would normally expect the locative:

*cito 'gnir udvahan yajñam pakṣābhyām tān prabādhate* "The piled-up fire that carries up the sacrifice frustrates them on both sides", Mbh 3.210.17<sup>4</sup>

*makarasya tu tuṇḍe vai karṇo rājan vyavasthitaḥ / netrābhyām śakuniḥ śūra ulūkaś ca mahārathaḥ* "O king! Karṇa is standing in the mouth of [the army, which is arrayed in the form of a] makara, while the heroic Śakuni and Ulūka, the great warrior, are placed in its eyes", Mbh 8,7.15 (v.l. *netrayoḥ* [cf. critical notes ad loc.])

*dvihi kulehi ... bodhisattvā jāyanti, kṣatriyakule brāhmaṇakule vā* "The Bodhisattvas are born in two kinds of families, either in the family of a Kṣatriya or in the family of a Brāhmaṇa", Mvu I,197.12<sup>5</sup>

... *śūlena protaḥ* "He was impaled on a stake", Prabhācandra's Ārādhana-kāthā-prabandha 45,10<sup>6</sup>, corresponding to *śūle protaḥ*, Nemidatta's Ārādhana-kāthākośa 23.9, and to *śūlikāyām niveśitaḥ*, Hariṣeṇa's Bṛhatkathākośa 62.12 (cf. *śūle protaḥ purāṇarṣir acoraś coraśaṅkayā*, Mbh 1,57.77, *śūle protaḥ*, 1,101.11)

There may be a slight semantic difference between the *instrumentalis (loci)* and the locative proper (cf. Wijesekera 1993:

<sup>4</sup> Most probably it is this stanza that Sen had in mind when he maintained that *pakṣābhyām* is used in the Mahābhārata for the locative (1958: 25) – but unfortunately without giving a reference.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. BHSG 7.32, where further examples are cited (cf. § 7.30-31 and 7.34).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Upadhye 1974: 21.

§ 166e), but on the whole both cases are interchangeable<sup>7</sup>, as the *variae lectiones* show<sup>8</sup>. Thus the locative and the instrumental can be used in coordination: *dvau putrau vinatā vavre kadrūputrādhikau bale / ojasā tejasā caiva vikrameṇādhikau sutau* "Vinatā chose two sons who were to exceed Kadrū's sons in strength and to excel them in brilliance, beauty, and might", Mbh 1,14.8<sup>9</sup>.

In this respect, the fact that the Epic poets partly used the instrumental and partly the locative to convey what is evidently the same meaning is very instructive. Compare e.g. a) *durmantritena* vs. *durmantrite* b) *durnayaiḥ* vs. *durnaye* c) *prayojanam* + instr. vs. + loc.<sup>10</sup>:

<sup>7</sup> Usually the locative is used to denote the asterism "at (/ under) which" something takes place, but occasionally the instrumental is, as already stated by Pāṇ 2.3.45 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 78 rem. 2; Hopkins [1903: 5] remarks that "the instrumental is regularly used with the words *puṣya-* and *tiṣya-*"). Thus we come across sentences like *mārgaśīrṣyām atītāyām puṣyeṇa prayayus tataḥ*, Mbh 3,91.25, *puṣyeṇa samprayāto 'smi śravaṇe punar āgataḥ*, Mbh 9,33.5 or *kṣībhāgī bhaven martyaḥ kurvaṇ śrāddham punarvasau / puṣṭikāmo 'tha puṣyeṇa śrāddham iheta mānavaḥ*, Mbh 13,89.4.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *utsaṅgena vyāla ivāhrto 'si* "You are like a snake which we took with (= into) our lap", Mbh 2,57.3 (v.l. *utsaṅge nu / ca*), *sa tad ājñāya duṣṭātmā pitur vacanam apriyam / nirāśaḥ sarvakalyāṇaiḥ śocan paryapatan mahīm* "Hearing these unfriendly words of his father the wicked [Aśvatthāman], despairing of obtaining every kind of prosperity, began in grief to wander over the earth", Mbh 10,12.10 (v.l. *°kalyāṇe* [cf. critical notes ad loc.]). The word *nirāśa-* is frequently construed with the locative (*nirāśāni svajīvite*, Mbh 4,58.13, *nirāśa jīvite 'bhavan*, 5,48.47, *tau nirāśau madarthe*, Rāmāyaṇa 5,35.61), but also with other cases (cf. PW s.v. [where, however, no example for the instrumental is given]).

<sup>9</sup> Most probably Pisani (1946: 188) is wrong to contend that *tasmin* is related to *paṇitena* in the sentence *tataḥ sā vinatā tasmin paṇitena parājītā* "Then Vinatā was defeated in that bet", Mbh 1,20.3. It must be construed with *paṇitena*: "... was defeated in the bet on that [horse]".

<sup>10</sup> The cases multiply when we go into the manuscripts, as can be seen from Kulkarni's investigation of the case variations in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata (1946: 83, 96, 103-104, 114-115, 134, 149, 172, 187, 200, 215).

(a)

- *sa śete niṣṭanan bhūmau vātarugna iva drumah / mama durmantritenāsau yathā nārhaḥ sa bhārata*, Mbh 6,15.15
- *bhīmo bhīma balo rājams / tava durmantritena ha*, Mbh 7,90.24
- *saṁsmṛtya sarvaduḥkhāni / tava durmantritena ca*, Mbh 7,162.52
- *kṣatriyā nidhanam yānti / karna durmantritena ca*, Mbh 6,92.7

(b)

- *vinaṣṭān kauravān manye / mama putrasya durnayaiḥ*, Mbh 7,108.7

(c)

- *bheṣajaiḥ kiṁ prayojanam*, Mbh 12,137.52

(a)

- *sa śete niṣṭanan bhūmau vātarugna iva drumah / tava durmantrite rājan yathā nārhaḥ sa bhārata*, Mbh 6,14.13
- *tava durmantrite rājan / sa putrasya viśaṁ pate*, Mbh 7,107.31
- *tava durmantrite rājan / sahaputrasya bhārata*, Mbh 9,16.85
- *rājan durmantrite tava*, Mbh 6,58.19 = 7,80.31 = 122.88 = 127.26 = 157.12 = 8,40.6 = 40.129 = 9,15.37 = 22.41 = 22.71

(b)

- *avyūhatārjuno vyūham / putrasya tava durnaye*, Mbh 8,32.3 (cf. [ambike] *tava putrasya / durnayāt kila bhārataḥ*, Mbh 1,119.9)

(c)

- *papracchāgamane hetum aṭane ca prayojanam*, Mbh 3,89.3
- *na me prayojanam kiṁcid gamane pannagāśana*, Mbh 5,110.15

- *na hi me vidyate sūta jīvite*  
'dya prayojanam, Mbh 6-73.26
- *gārhaspatye kiṃ prayojanam*, Mbh 12.261.4
- *vacane kiṃ prayojanam*, Mbh 12.308.127
- (cf. *yadā jīvitena prayojanam*, Pañcatantra 162,6, 256,12 [PW s.v.])
- *jīvite ca prayojanam*, Mbh 13,54.39
- *jīvite 'sti prayojanam*, R (Bomb.) 4,1.31
- *gamane kiṃ prayojanam*, R (Bomb.) 5,60.6
- (d)
- (cf. *na ca me ... jīvitena kṛtyam*, Mṛcchakaṭika 154,3)
- (d)
- *bhoḥ kiṃ āgamane kṛtyam* “What is the use of coming”, Mbh 13,41.14

As far as (d) *āgamane* is concerned, the sequence °ane<na> (preceded by another nasal!) may have led to the loss of the syllable *na* by haplology (cf. AiGr. III § 32bα)<sup>11</sup>. This haplological loss may account for the cases where a locative and an instrumental are coordinated:

*sudhanvan vipaṇe<na> tena praśnam prcchāva ye viduḥ* “With that stake we shall ask the question of those who know”, Mbh 5,35.13, *sainyena rajasāvrte<na>* “by the dust of the army which covered [everything]”, Mbh 9,16.77 = 20.31 = 22.48 = 28.12, *sainyena rajasā dhvaste<na>* (*nirmaryādam avartata*) “by the dust of the army which was scattered [all around]”, Mbh 7,73.53 (cf. *sainye ca rajasā dhvaste nirmaryādam avartata*, 7,31.33)

In some cases, however, we only find the locative used where we would expect the instrumental: *vāsudevasyānumate* “With the consent of Vāsudeva”, Mbh 1,2.92. And *anumate* is much too frequent<sup>12</sup> to be explained by such a “sporadic” phenomenon as syllabic haplology (even if we take it as a generalized form). It may represent an (abbreviated) *locativus absolutus*: *anumate (sati)* “when there is consent”, which exactly amounts to “with the consent (of)”. And it is this feature – (abbreviated) *locativus absolutus* = instrumental – which may have contributed to the further merging of both cases. Consequently we not only encounter the *locativus absolutus* but also an *instrumentalis absolutus* (cf. BHS § 7.34, Upadhye 1943: 100):

*kṛṣṇena samupetena jāhṛṣe bhāratam puram* “When Kṛṣṇa arrived, the city of the Bhāratas burst out shouting with joy”, Mbh 2,30.15 (cf. *anyaiḥ samṛddhair apy arthair na sutād vidyate param* “For surely, a son prevails, and nothing prevails

<sup>11</sup> The same holds true for *anaśane<na>* in the sentence *deham vānaśane tyaktvā sa svargam samupāśnute* “Having died by fasting he reaches heaven”, Mbh 13,130.47 – unless we are to translate “having died in fasting”. This feature is to be found in Pali too: (*gāmehi nigamehi vā ratthe<hi>* (*janapadehi vā*), Ja VI 294,27\*, *vasanehi anūpame<hi>*, Thī 374 (cf. Bechert 1955: 13 n. 25). This explanation (on which cf. Norman, transl. p. 138) is certainly to be preferred to Pischel's: “*anūpame* is instr. plur.” (Thī-ed. p. 209). Cf. *mamaṃ rodantiyā sati<yā>*, Ja VI 188,2\* (*rodamānāyā satiyā*, ct.).

<sup>12</sup> *anumate* “with the consent of” is attested in the following places of the epics: Mbh 1,54.11, 77.2, 96.4, 99.17, 108.18, 124.3, 150.3, 196.11, 199.50, 3.7.17, 117.13, 161.14, 267.13, 281.79, 5,31.16, 32.6, 47.2, 171.4, 7,66.2, 102.81, 102.83, 152.11, 9,16.10, 31.29, 12,5.7, 31.41, 274.15, 274.20, 321.13, 13,34.27, 14,26.13, 51.53, 15,13.7, 13.8, 13.16, 25.13, R 1,61.23, 66.24, 67.6, 2,38.7, 69.14.

over a son", Mbh 3,10.5, *punyāhaghoṣair vimalair vedānām ninadais tathā / deveṣu caiva vyagreṣu tasmin yajñavidhau tadā*, Mbh 9,37.6 [v.l. G M °ghoṣe vipule ... ninade (cf. crit. notes ad loc.)].

Since no one will maintain that any of all these forms in *-ena* or *-aiḥ* / *-ebhiḥ* is any case other than an instrumental, I do not see why *dantehi* in the following sentences should be considered as a locative (as is done by von Hinüber § 321, and id. 1968: § 307)<sup>13</sup>: *ajinamhi haññate dīpī nāgo dantehi haññati* "The leopard is killed for his skin, the elephant for his tusks", Ja VI 78,17\* (*ajinamhi haññate dīpī / nāgo dantehi haññati / dhanamhi dhanino hanti aniketam asanthavam*, Ja VI 61,4\*)<sup>14</sup>.

Turning to the Prakrits, we meet with the same phenomenon of the — at least partial — interchangeability of instrumental and locative<sup>15</sup>: *eehi muṇi sayañehiṃ samaṇa āsi patelasa vāse* "The sage [and] monk dwelt for thirteen years in those resting-places" (Āyāraṅgasutta 1.9.2.4), *Lāḍhehi tassa uvasaggā bahave* "He had many difficulties in Lāḍha" (l. c. 1.9.3.3). It is a characteristic feature of the language of Vimalasūri's

<sup>13</sup> We can single out at least one of Lüders' in any case rather few examples: *kāmesu ve haññare bajjhare ca / kāmesu dukkhaṃ ca bhayaṃ ca jātaṃ / kāmesu bhūtādhipatī pamattā / pāpāni kammāni karonti mohā*, Ja IV 312,27\*-30\* (~ Jāt-m 114,17\*-20\*). Here Lüders' explanation of *kāmesu* is certainly wrong. The poet started the stanza with *kāmesu*, a *nimitta-saptamī* — as the Indian grammarians call it —, and as he obviously wished to repeat *kāmesu* for the sake of emphasis, he used in pāda b and c the (shortened) *locativus absolutus kāmesu (santesu)* "when (there are) desires".

<sup>14</sup> As is well known (Kielhorn 1898: 18-19 [= Kl. Sch. p. 295-296]) a quite similar stanza is found in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya: *carmaṇi dvīpinam hanti dantayor hanti kuñjaram* (I 458,18).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Ghatage 1937 and 1941: § 372, Upadhye 1944: 53; cf. also Paumacariya, Vol. I (Prakrit Text Society 6, Varanasi 1962), p. 33.

Paumacariya: *ambarataleṇa vaccai*, 8.42<sup>16</sup>. But it is here that "the locative is regularly used for the instrumental" (Ghatage 1937: 56, cf. id. 1953: 116): *nānāviha-pāyavesu samchannā* "covered with trees of various sorts" (Paumacariya 17.29 [reading of J, the oldest ms. available<sup>17</sup>]), *karemi mahilāsu saha ñeḥam* "I make love with the women" (ibid. 108.39). This merging of instrumental and locative was completed in Apabhraṃśa, as is well known: "Der Verwendungsbereich des loc. ist [im Apabhraṃśa] gegenüber dem Pkt. stark erweitert. ... Der loc. tritt häufig ein für den instr. Die Verwechslung geht nach Jacobi (San. § 14) vom plur. aus, wo beide Kasus schon früh lautlich und begrifflich zusammengefallen sind. So dient der loc. auch im sing. gleichzeitig als instr. bei den femininen A- und I-Stämmen. Für die Verwendung des loc. sing. der masc. und neutr. A-Stämme als instr. bietet Bh[avisatta Kaha] (S. 34\* Anm. 1) 27, San[atukumāracaritam] (§ 14) 3 Belege. Im Kum[ārapālpratibodha] finden wir 15 instr. auf -i" (Alsdorf 1928: 64; cf. Singh 1980: 52, Bhayani 1953: 63).

Taking into account all these facts I see no reason why the Pali phenomenon should be treated quite differently. Here, too, it is a matter of *syntax* and *not of morphology*. A sentence like ... *tittthehi ... assaṃ pāyehi*, Ja I 185,3\*, has its counterpart in *bhuñjate rukmapātrībhiḥ* "They eat on (/from) golden plates", Mbh 2,45.18 (cf. Meenakshi 1983: 72).

## 1.2. Pali/Prakrit and Epic-Purāṇic Sanskrit

Popular Sanskrit, as evidenced by both Epics and the Purāṇas, and Middle Indo-Aryan also share a number of grammatical and lexical features. Some of them are very frequently attested both in the Epics and

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Jacobi 1918: 60\*, Upadhye 1944: 153.

<sup>17</sup> See Paumacariya, vol. II, p. XVI.

Purāṇas and in the Theravāda canon: the gen. pl. in (Skt.) °*inām* and °*ūnām* resp. (P.) °*inaṃ* and °*ūnaṃ* (cf. Geiger § 83.8<sup>18</sup>), the same form to denote the nom. and the acc. pl. in the feminine *ī*-declension(s), in the *r*-declension (of words signifying personal relations) and in the *n*-declension, the acc. pl. (Skt.) *gāvaḥ* resp. (P.) *gāvo* (cf. Geiger § 88.3), the generalization of the weak stem (Skt.) *viduṣ-* resp. (P.) *vidū-* (cf. Geiger § 100.2), the transfer of stems from one declension to another one (leading to the merging of [masc.] *i-* and *in*-declensions and of feminine *i-* and *ī*-declensions and to the emergence of new words like *apsarā-* / *accharā-* [etc.]), the genitives (Skt.) *mahyam* and *tubhyam* resp. (P.) *mayhaṃ* and *tuyhaṃ* (etc.). Some of them, however, are only sporadically encountered, such as:

- certain normalizations within the pronominal inflexion: loc. sg. fem. (Skt.) *paścimasyām* (cf. R 1,60.3 v.l., 4,36.3, Hariv. 93,15<sup>19</sup>), analogical to other pronouns denoting cardinal points (cf. AiGr. III § 268f); vice versa, (P.) *uttarāya[m]*<sup>20</sup> (beside *uttarassam disāyam*, SN I 148,4\*/6\* [Geiger § 113.8; cf. AiGr. III § 267aα]).
- *viṃśat-* instead of °*viṃśati-* and °*triṃśati-* instead of *triṃśat-*<sup>21</sup>.
- ordinal number instead of cardinal number: (Skt.) *ekaviṃśaś ca daśa ca*, Mbh 12,308.112, *caturviṃśaṃ putraśataṃ babhūva*,

<sup>18</sup> There are more examples: *pāṇinam*, Th 1258, *sivinaṃ*, Ja IV 405,24\* (C\* *sivinaṃ* [faulty metre]), *abandhunam*, Th 240, Ap 323,22 (cf. CPD s.v. *abandhu*).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Brhatkathākośa 71.1, 99.53 (Upadhye 1943: 97).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. *uttara* (DN I 153,19, Ap 541,5, Ja V 43,11' [commenting on *uttariyaṃ disāyam*, 42,21\*]). Cf. JM. *uttarāyaṃ disāyam*, Vasudevahiṇḍi 280.27 (cf. 310.22 and 323.18).

<sup>21</sup> Pali *vīsa(m)-* (Sn 1019, It 99, Ja V 36,22), Skt. (°)*viṃśat-* (Mbh 1,2.199 v.l., 1,180\*, R 6,55.7; in compounds: *viṃśadbhuja-*, R 3,30.8, 3,33.9 v.l., *viṃśadbāhu-*, R 7,32.49, *viṃśadyojana-*, R 5,1.145), Pali (*chat*)*tiṃśati-* (Dhp 339), Skt. *triṃśati-* (Mbh 6,57.12, 12,103.20, R 6,55.7 v.l., 6,96.14 v.l.).

Mbh 1,90.39, *viṃśabhuja-*, R 7,9.22 v.l., (P.) *pañcamehi bandhanehi*, SN IV 201,22, 202,9 (Geiger § 118.4).

- the accusative of the enclitic form of the pronouns in place of the nominative / vocative<sup>22</sup>.
- the usage of *asmi* in the sense of *aham*<sup>23</sup>.
- misplaced *iti* in direct speech (cf. Pisani 1934: 74-75)<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> (P.) nom. *vo*, Ja VI 576,29\*, Mil 19.4, Mhv I 14,3 (cf. Oberlies 1995: 143; for BHS cf. BHSG § 20.44, for JM. Alsdorf 1935/37: 331 = Kl. Sch. p. 68 [*jeṇaṃ vo samaṇeṇaṃ mahājāṇamañjhe ohāmiyā taṃ pacchannaṃ jīviyāo vavaroveha*, Vasudevahiṇḍi 88.21]), voc. *vo*, Vin I 23,21/25, nom. *no*, Ja VI 578,20\* (cf. CPD I/531 [sub (ḍ)], Bechert 1958: 312; for BHS cf. BHSG § 20.39), (Skt.) *etām buddhiṃ samāsthāya karṣitau vām mayā kṣudhā* "Having come to that decision both of you grew lean by me, hunger", Mbh 13,55.19 (cf. AiGr. III § 236bβ rem.).

<sup>23</sup> This usage is rather often encountered in the Prakrits (cf. Pischel §417, Alsdorf 1935/37: 326-327 [= Kl. Sch. pp. 63-64], Upadhye 1944: 52 [where Dhūrtākhyāna II.2, IV.2/4 is concerned]). It seems to be very rare in Pali: *saṃhatṭhalomo avacasmī bhūto* (for *avac<am> asmi*), "I said", Ja V 165,27\* (cf. Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 162), *saṃviggo 'mhi tadā āsim*, Ap 195,7 (CPD I/529, col. a, ll. 33-35; cf. Bechert 1958: 312). The same holds true for Epic Sanskrit: *eso 'smi hanmi saṃkalpam* "I frustrate your plans", Mbh 8,12.34 v.l. (CE *eso 'sya hanmi*). In Purāṇic Sanskrit, however, it becomes much more frequent (I take the examples from Pathak 1969: 126): *vicarāmy asmi*, Skandapurāṇa II 5.21, *asmi vasāmi*, Skandapurāṇa II 32.165 (cf. *pibasy asi*, Skandapurāṇa II 40.88 [cf. Vāmana 5,2.82 (PW VII/1705)]). And we know this usage also from works written in "Classical" Sanskrit: *avocam asmi*, Buddhacarita 1.67, *nṛmāmsam asmi vikrīṇe*, Kathāsaritsāgara 25.187, Bodhicaryāvatāra 3.7, cf. Mallinātha ad Kirātārjunīya 3.6: *asmīty aham-arthe 'vyayam* (cf. PW I/536 n. \*).

<sup>24</sup> (P.) *Bhāradvājo +ti bhāsatī*, Sn 596; (Skt.) *abravīd iti mām bhīṣma vacanaṃ prītivardhanam / ahaṃ priyatamaḥ putraḥ*, Mbh 1,122.28, *praviśya tad veśma mahārathānām ity abravīd draupadīm rājaputrīm*, Mbh 2,60.19, *ity evam ārtah paridevayan saḥ / rājā kurūṇāṃ nakulaṃ babhāṣe*, Mbh 10,10.26, *tīrthayātrā sāmudre vaḥ kāryeti puruṣarṣabhāḥ*, Mbh 16,3.22, *sa putram ekaṃ rājyāya pālayeti niyujya ca / prthivīm kṣatradharmaṇa vanam evānvapadyata*, R 1,54.11 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 495), *śūśrāva ca vacas teṣāṃ ... hatāḥ sma khalu ye neha*

- the use of the masculine participle in construction with a feminine noun: *obhāsayaṃ vanaṃ rammaṃ ... kā vā tvam asi kalyāṇi*, Ja V 89,24\*, ... *sā khujjā ... evaṃ dubbhāsitaṃ bhaṇaṃ*, Ja V 299,2\* (cf. Oberlies 1995: 109 s.v. *anibbisam*); *vārṣṇeyaṃ tu tato bhaimī sāntvayaṇ ślakṣṇayā girā*, Mbh 3,57.11 (cf. ... *tato rājā sāntvayaṇ ślakṣṇayā girā*, 1,92.30, *tathā ṛṣir uvācainaṃ sāntvayaṇ ślakṣṇayā girā*, 1,166.5), *nirīkṣamāṇā ... munivaco smaran*, Mbh 3,280.32, *sā drṣṭvā kṛṣṇam āyāntam ... prthāpārthān anusmaran*, Mbh 5,88.2.

The peculiarities of the verbal system common to Pali and non-standard Sanskrit are even more striking. Let me cite just one example, namely the “wrong” and “misplaced” addition of the augment: (P.) *pacc-a-niyyāhi*, DN II 22,16, *a-paribrūhayi*, Ja V 361,16\* (cf. CPD s.v. <sup>2</sup>a, Rem. a/b), (BHS) *adhy-a-bhāṣati abhy-a-siñcet, upāsamkrāmat* (cf. BHS § 32.5, 8, 12), (Skt.) *pary-a-rundhīta*, R 4,1143\* (~ *pratyarautsīt*, 4,1144\*), (imp.) *abhy-a-bhāṣa*, R 4,3.25, (part.) *vy-a-caran*, R 3,37.3/4, *vy-a-dīpayan*, R 2,5.24, *abhy-a-vahan*, R 4,11\*, *a-sambhramat*, Mbh 6,78.38, 7,75.5, *praty-a-vyūhan*, Mbh 3,269.6, *praty-a-samharam*, R 5,56.55.

A close comparison of these languages sheds light on linguistic phenomena of Middle Indo-Aryan ill-judged in our grammars (cf. 1.2.1.). And it even may help to solve some of the enigmas of Indo-Aryan philology which have long troubled scholars (cf. 1.2.2.). I shall briefly discuss two examples to illustrate these points.

---

*paśyāma iti rāghavam*, R 2,51.10, *ity uvāca vacaḥ krūram didhakṣann iva tejasā / kiṃ tavāpakṛtaṃ rājan vane nivasatā mayā*, R 2,57.29.

### 1.2.1. Syncopation

It is only in the “latest additions” of the pW (p. 315 s.v. *astra*) that the two “Petersburger Wörterbücher” give for *iṣvastra-* the meaning “the science of arms” (with reference to Mbh 1,123.13.43)<sup>25</sup>. But also at Mbh 5,178.16 (*iṣvastraṃ mama bālasya bhavataiva caturvidham / upadiṣṭam ...*) and 9,5.14 (*daśāṅgaṃ yaś catuṣpādam iṣvastraṃ veda tattvataḥ*) this word clearly has this meaning – as it has at Divyāvadāna 528.6. Obviously, Pischel (as also Chatterji 1983: 63) was not aware of this meaning of *iṣvastra-* when he derived the Prakrit word *īsattha-* from Skt. *iṣuśāstra-* (§ 148). In order to overcome the phonetic difficulties he had to postulate the loss of the vowel *-u-*: *īsattha-* ← *\*is[u]sattha-*. According to Pischel, about ten words show this complete loss of a vowel. But, as with *īsattha-*, some of them also have to be explained differently: α) *uppim*<sup>26</sup> ← *upari x uttara[m]*; β) *khu / hu*<sup>27</sup> ← *kho* ← *kha'u*<sup>28</sup>; γ) *majjhanna*<sup>29</sup> ← (by *dh*\_\_\_*h*-dissimilation) *madhyāhna-* (Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 1879-1880; AiGr. I § 108 n.); δ) *sunhā-* / *sonhā*<sup>30</sup> ← *\*ñhusā-* ← *snuṣā-* (Jacobi 1886: XXXII n. 3). So we are left only with *subbhi-* (← *sur<sub>a</sub>bhi-*) and (the analogically formed) *dubbhi-* and, interestingly enough, with some kinship terms: *dhīyā-* (← nom. sg. *duhitā* [already dissyllabic in late Vedic: Lüders, Phil. Ind. p. 506]), *piusiyā-*, *bhāujjā-*, *māussīā-* (etc.). But we know that kinship terms are, being terms of address, subject to irregular shortening. So there is only one single example for the phenomenon of “vowel loss”. Could *subbhi-*

<sup>25</sup> Neither Monier-Williams nor Apte gives this meaning.

<sup>26</sup> Pischel derived this word from *up<sub>a</sub>ri*.

<sup>27</sup> For the derivation of this word see below.

<sup>28</sup> Such particles often show peculiar phonetics (cf. Jacobi 1886: LXXII).

<sup>29</sup> Pischel derived it from *madhyam<sub>d</sub>na-*.

<sup>30</sup> Pischel derived these words from *sun<sub>h</sub>hā-*, the ‘h-variant’ of *sunusā-* which is a continuation of *snuṣā-*.

and *dubbhi-* be words of the women's language and do they as such have a more popular form?

If we take a closer look at the paragraph of Geiger's grammar dealing with vowel syncopation (§ 20), some of its examples likewise disappear: *jaggati* is not "to be traced from *jāgarati* through \**jāg<sup>a</sup>rati*", but has developed out of (Epic) Sanskrit (3. sg.) *jāgrati*<sup>31</sup>, based on the present stem *jāgra<sup>o</sup>* which was extracted from (3. pl.) *jāgrati*; *kho* does not result from *khahu* by syncopation of *a*, but is due to the loss of the intervocalic *l* and the subsequent contraction of *a-u* to *o* (cf. Pisani 1952: 281); and *°mhe* (besides *°mahe*) is based on a form \**-āme* (= *x* : *-āma* = *-ate* : *-ati* = *-ase* : *-asi* = *-ante* : *-anti*) into which the *h* of *-ahve* has been introduced (cf. Berger 1957: 112)<sup>32</sup>.

It is evident that Epic Sanskrit enjoins us to reconsider the whole phenomenon of the *syncopation* of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan and to look for the special conditions under which it takes place. Vowels are syncopated, as far as I can see, only in words or word elements that are "phonetically weak" – to borrow Turner's term (Coll. Papers p. 291) – such as (I) second members of compounds, (II) enclitics, (III) suffixes and (IV) terms of address.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 497, Tedesco 1947: 176, Berger 1955: 18 n. 14.

<sup>32</sup> Geiger's second example, *oka-* from *udaka-*, is very problematic (cf. Tedesco 1947: 176), since there is only *one* single place where *oka-* certainly means "water", viz. Vin I 253,14: *oka-puṇṇehi cīvarehi* "with cloaks filled with water" (not recorded by Geiger). So we have to allow for the possibility that it is a mere blunder of the text – the more so as it is obscure (pace Geiger's explanation) exactly where the *o-* comes from (should we read +*odapūṇṇehi* with *oda-* wrongly abstracted from compounds like *nīloda-*?).

### 1.2.2. Preterites in °ī(y)a

In a great number of Prakrit texts we come across a petrified preterite form in °īa used for all numbers (in that respect resembling *āsi* [Pischel § 515]): *acchīa*, *āsīya*, *geṇhīa*, *vasīya*<sup>33</sup>. So far no explanation of these °ī(y)a pasts has been given. I think Pischel was on the right track when he supposed that this form must be an optative, "as inexplicable as this seems" (Pischel § 466). Now it is a well known fact that in non-standard Sanskrit an optative can be used in place of a past tense<sup>34</sup>; and we know that optatives were used as preterites in Prakrit, too<sup>35</sup>. As we have °īta-optatives – since late Vedic times even in the thematic conjugation (cf. Hoffmann 1976: 371)<sup>36</sup> – I suggest that the cited Prakrit form is the continuation of an °īta-optative. At the moment I can cite only one, but very instructive example: *pary-a-rundhīta*, R 4,1143\*, which corresponds to *pratyarautsīt*, 4.1144\*! Once this °īa was deemed an ending of the past tense, it was even appended to aorist stems (*kāsīya*, *kaheśīya*, *ṭhāsīya*).

### 2. Late Vedic, Epic Sanskrit, Pāṇini and Pali

The relationship of Pali to late Vedic on the one hand and to Pāṇini's Sanskrit (especially to the *bhāṣā* he described) on the other has

<sup>33</sup> These forms are discussed and text references are given by (e.g.) Alsdorf 1935/37: 325 (= Kl. Sch. p. 62), Bhayani / Shah 1987: 44, and Balbir 1989: 510-512 (with literature); cf. Alsdorf 1957: 207 n. 1 (= Kl. Sch. p. 191 n. 1) and Bollée 1995: 144 (s.v. *-īya*).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. BHSG § 32.85-105, Dschi 1949: 250 n. 1, Upadhye 1943: 100, Katre 1937, 1938 and 1939.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Pischel § 466, von Hinüber § 445 and Balbir 1989: 509 with n. 39.

<sup>36</sup> For the Mahābhārata cf. *bhakṣayīta*, Mbh 13,107.82, *vivarjayīta*, Mbh 5,39.35, *prativāsayīta*, Mbh 5,37.31, *yājayīta*, Mbh 3,197.35. Interestingly enough, the Rāmāyaṇa does not seem to know such forms.



never been systematically investigated (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 308-310). But even a cursory reading of the Jātakas brings a number of further parallels to light.

### 2.1. *iva* instead of *eva*

Since late Vedic times *iva* is used “in the sense practically of *eva*” (Keith 1920: 89, cf. id. 1908: 1192-1193): *prṣṭhata ivāgnīdhram kṛtvā* “placing the Agnīdh’s altar at his back”, AitB 1.30, *yadi ha vā api bahava iva yajante* “even if many sacrifice”, AitB 2.2, *so ’je jyoktamām ivāramata* “[The camel] dwelt for the longest time in the goat”, AitB 2.8<sup>37</sup>. The same usage is met with in Epic Sanskrit: *tato nātimahān kālah samatūta ivābhavat* “Not too long a time had passed since then”, Mbh 1,35.3, *prāñjalim prahvam āsīnam abhivikṣya smayann iva* “smiling as he looked at him ...”, R 2,4.42 (at least according to the explanation of Ck)<sup>38</sup>. This probably accounts for the pleonastic collocation *iva ... yathā*: *vicikṣipur yathā śyenā nabhogatam ivāmiṣam* (—) “As vultures tear apart a piece of raw meat thrown into the air”, Mbh 2,33.6, *adhāryamānā sraj ivottamā yathā* (—) “Like a beautiful garland that is not being worn”, Mbh 4,13.11 (cf. *kiṃ mātūr anke śayito yathā śīśuś / candram jighṛkṣur iva manyase hi mām*, Mbh 4,13.21). The same phenomenon is met with in Pali (cf. CPD s.v. *iva*). On the other hand, *eva* is sometimes used where we would expect *iva*: *bhasmany eva hutāśanaḥ*, Mbh 4,36.29 v.1. (crit. ed. *bhasmaneva* [cf. PW V,1222 s.v. *eva*]); *alāpūn’ eva*, Dhṛp 149, *dhajaggān’ eva dissare*, Ja VI 529,33\* = 530,24\*, *rohiṇī h’ eva tamb’ akkhī*, Ja VI 576,6\* (emended by Alsdorf, Kl. Sch. p. 312 resp. 325, to *dhajaggānīva* resp. *hīva*); *macchā vesāliya*

<sup>37</sup> Thieme pointed out this function of *iva* which he called “relativierend” (1963: 105 n. 2 [= Kl. Sch. p. 195 n. 2]).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. R 2,12.2, 108.6 (cf. Pollock. The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki. Vol. II. Ayodhyākāṇḍa. Note *ad loc.*) and 3,13.3.

*c’ eva udagass’ abhiyāgama*, Sūyagaḍaṅga 1.1.3.2 (or does *c’ eva* represent *ca + iva*?).

### 2.2. *ca* instead of *ce*

Pāṇini 8.1.30 distinguishes between two words *ca* by adding to one the marker *ṇ*. This *caṇ* is, as is explained by Kātyāyana (*caṇ ṇidviśiṣṭas cedathe*), equivalent to *cet* “if”: *ayaṃ ca vai mariṣyati* (= *ayaṃ cen mariṣyati* (Mahābhāṣya III 375,8). The greater “Petersburger Wörterbuch” cites several examples from Vedic literature (cf. Speyer 1896: § 282, Renou 1952: 384) and one from the Mahābhārata<sup>39</sup>: *jīvitum cecchase mūḍha hetum me gadataḥ śṛṇu* “If you want to survive ...”, Mbh 3,256.10 (= 4, App.32.13 [v.l. *jīvam icchasi cen mūḍha*]). One more reference can be added: *vakṣyāmi ... manyase ca mām*, Mbh 13,38.5 (v.l. *cet*). This use of *ca* seems to have been obliterated in Classical Sanskrit<sup>40</sup>. But it is quite often to be found in the Jātakas<sup>41</sup>: *ciraṃ pi kho taṃ khādeyya gadrabho haritaṃ yavaṃ / ... ravamāno ca dūsayi* (—) “The donkey would have eaten ... the barley for a long time if he had not come to harm by his cry”, Ja II 110,18\*-19\*, *idaṇ ca tuyhaṃ rucitaṃ / Sutasoma aji’ evā dāni tvaṃ pabbaja* “If this pleases you ...”, Ja V 185,22\*<sup>42</sup>, *sakko ca*<sup>43</sup> *me varam dajjā / so ca labbhetha me varo* “If Sakka should give me a boon my choice would be quickly taken”, Ja V

<sup>39</sup> The stanza Bhartṛhari 2.45 cited by PW (*lobhaś cāsti guṇena ...*) is Nitisataka 37 and runs in Kosambi’s edition as follows: *lobhaś ced aguṇena kiṃ piṣunatā yady asti kiṃ pātakaiḥ!*

<sup>40</sup> For details cf. Gonda 1957: 52-54 (= Selected Studies I,371-373).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Gonda 1957: 54 (= Selected Studies I,373). Cf. Sūyagaḍaṅga 1.1.3.9: ... *loyaṃ būyā, kaḍe’ tti ya* “If they maintain that ...” (cf. Bollée 1977: 112-113 and 193 s.v. *ya* [with a reference to Wackernagel, Kl. Sch. p. 257-261]).

<sup>42</sup> The first *pāda* is a *bha-vipulā* (cf. Alsdorf 1968: 34) whose third syllable has to be a short one.

<sup>43</sup> Fausbøll’s manuscript B<sup>d</sup> reads *ce*.

216,1\*<sup>44</sup>, *sabbañ ca*<sup>45</sup> *maccā sadhanā sabhogā / ādīpitam dāru tinena missam* “If people would burn all wood ...”, Ja VI 206,9\*, *etañ ca saccam vacanam bhavēyya / ... / nākhattiyo jātu labhetha rajjam* “If this word were true ... no non-kṣatriya would obtain kingship”, Ja VI 208,1\*/3\*<sup>46</sup>. The poets obviously use *ca* due to metrical exigencies as a “doublet prosodique” (Smith 1950: 3) of *ce*. And since *ca* is used in the sense of *ce*, *ce*, vice versa, sometimes stands for *ca*: *tathā mañ saccam pāletu / pālayissati ce mamañ* (—!) “Hence truth should protect me — and surely, it will protect me”, Ja V 95,1\*<sup>47</sup>, *thale yathā +vāri janinda vaṭṭam / anaddhaneyyam aciraṭṭhitikam / evaṃ pi ce hoti asatam samāgamo* “Like water rained down on dry land, not lasting, of no long permanence, so, o king, is the association with bad people”, Ja V 508,1\*. Here *ce* is joined to *pi*<sup>48</sup> as often as is *ca*.

### 2.3. *su* as an *upasarga*

Pāṇini teaches in his rules 1.4.58-59 that *pra* etc. are called *upasargas* if they are linked directly to verbs. According to the corresponding *gaṇa* the word *su* belongs to this group. That means that *su* should be used as a verbal prefix! And indeed, we find several examples of this use in Epic Sanskrit: *sv-anuyāsyanti*, Mbh 8,22.59 v.l., *su-upatasthe*, Mbh (cited by Whitney § 1121i without reference), *su-kurute*, Mbh 7,163.30 v.l., *sv-ajanayat*, Mbh 3,217.6 v.l. (ed. Bomb., not

<sup>44</sup> This line corresponds to Mvu III 6,15: *śakraś ca* (thus the manuscripts which Senart emended to *ce*) *me varam dadyāt*.

<sup>45</sup> According to Alsdorf (1977: 42) the Singhalese print (C) reads *ce*. But the third syllable of the *triṣṭubh-pāda* has to be a short one.

<sup>46</sup> If *bhuñjatu* can be used as a conditional the following example may be added: *idañ ca mayham uttiṭṭhapiṇḍam / +tam maṇḍavyo bhuñjatu appapañño / yakkhā ca te nam na viheṭṭhayeyyūṃ / putto ca te hohiti so arogo*, Ja IV 386,12\*-15\*.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Lüders, Märchen 253.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. *pubbe va dānā sumanā bhavāma / dadam pi ce* (B<sup>d</sup> *ca*) *attamanā bhavāma*, Ja IV 53,15\* (cf. Kern, Toev. I/108).

noted by CE [cf. PW s.v. 6. su]), *su-dhāsyati*, Mbh 1,114.31, *su-rocaya*, Mbh 4,1.8 v.l., *su-virājate*, Mbh 4,60.4 v.l., *su-śakyante*, R 2,30.4 v.l. The same holds true for Pali: *kiṃ sū-vadhivā na kadāci socati*, Ja V 141,10\*, corresponding to Mvu III 370,1\* *kiṃ so-vadhivā na kadāci socati* (cf. Smith 1950: 13)<sup>49</sup>, *(mā) su-nandi ... mā su-soci*, Ja I 300,20\* (*sukāro nipātamattam*, ct.), *su-māpaya*, Cariyāp. 9.107, *su-māpayi*, Cariyāp. 9.108, Mahāvamsa, App. A stanza 3 (ed. Geiger p. 326 n. 3), *su-bodddhum* Kaccāyanappakaraṇa 200 (ed. Senart [cf. Childers s.v. su at the end]), cf. (with a participle:) *su-codiyantam*, Ja VI 249,1\* (*suṭṭhu codiyantam*, ct.)<sup>50</sup>.

### 3. Vocabulary

But Pali and Epic Sanskrit can not only be adduced to confirm Pāṇini's rules as far as syntactical features are concerned, but also to confirm his teaching on how to form words with particular meanings. On the other hand, taking into account Pāṇini and late Vedic texts enables a number of Pali words of obscure meaning to be explained. First an example of the latter kind:

#### 3.1. *udaṅgaṇa*- (Ja I 109,15\*)

For this word the PED gives the meaning “an open space” — whereas the CPD gives no meaning at all — relying on the explanation of the commentary: *udaṅgaṇe ti ettha uda iti nipāto, aṅgaṇe ti attho, manussānam saṃcaraṇaṭṭhāne anāvate bhūmibhāge ti attho* (I 109,20'-21'). This is, of course, impossible, so another explanation is called for. We have in Pali *uluṅka*- / *uḷuṅka*- “ladle, spoon (for fetching water)”

<sup>49</sup> It cannot be ruled out that we have to do with *so* for *sū*, the regular outcome of *svid* (cf. Edgerton s.v. so).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Aḷāra etā su te +kāmākārā*, Ja V 170,29\*.

(cf. Ja I 120,23, 423,14) which corresponds to Skt. *udaṅka-* (Mānavaśrautasūtra 1.1.2, Pāṇ 3.3.123)<sup>51</sup>. This word is derived from *ud-√a(ñ)c*; this root denotes, as we know from Vedic texts (cf. Hoffmann 1975: 162-165), the action of drawing water (cf. *udañcanī*, Ja I 417,10\* [*udakaṃ añcanti etāya*, ct.]). It seems – despite all phonetic difficulties – that *udaṅgaṇa-* belongs to this very root: *akilāsuno vaṇṇupathe khaṇantā / udaṅgaṇe tattha papam avindum* “untiringly digging in the desert<sup>52</sup> they found there a watering place<sup>53</sup> for drawing up [the bucket]” (Ja I 109,15\*). The fondness of the poet of the stanza under discussion for “dark” words (*papā-*, *akilāsu-*, *vaṇṇu[patha]-*)<sup>54</sup> may account for this quite unusual sound change. We meet with a similar case of a transition of a (voiced) palatal into a guttural, and of a dental nasal into a cerebral, in certain derivations from *√aṇj* both in Pali ([*an-* / *nir-* / *s'-*] *aṅgaṇa-* “dirt”) and in Pkr. (*abbhaṅgaṇa-*, *niraṅgaṇa-* [Pischel § 234]).

### 3.2. *koleyyaka-* (Ja I 177,2\*)

Pāṇini teaches in rule 4.2.96 (*kula-kukṣi-grīvābhyah śvāsy-alamkāreṣu*; cf. 4.1.140) that the suffix *°eyaka-* is added to the word *kula-* to denote a “dog of good breed”. Our dictionaries show that the word *kauleyaka-* is found as late as the Kādambarī and Harṣacarita. Some

<sup>51</sup> This word should be added to the examples given by Oberlies 1995a: 191 of the dissimilation of *-d-* to *-l-* before a following nasal.

<sup>52</sup> For this meaning of *vaṇṇapatha-*, which is borne out by the prose-tale (cf. Ja I 107,23), cf. Lévi 1925: 47.

<sup>53</sup> We learn from Kātyāyana's *vārttika* 4 ad Pāṇ 3.3.58 that the word *prapā-* denotes a “place for supplying water” (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 309). In the Jātaka the word is attested one more time: *yathā nadī ca pantho ca pānāgāraṃ sabhā papā / evaṃ lokitthiyo nāma nāsaṃ kujjhanti paṇḍitā*, Ja I 302,3\* (for further references cf. PED s.v.; cf. Sadd p. 622 n. 18).

<sup>54</sup> Also the employment of the locative to denote purpose seems to be rather idiosyncratic.

centuries earlier it is found in the Jātaka: Ja I 177,2\*, II 348,21(\*) v.l. (B<sup>u</sup>), IV 437,18.

### 3.3. *gīveyya-* (Ja IV 395,17\*, VI 590,9\*)

According to the same rule of Pāṇini (4.2.96), the word *graiveyaka-* is formed to denote a piece of jewellery. Compared with the rather late attested Sanskrit word (Devīmāhātmya, Daśakumāracarita, Sāhityadarpana) the Pali word *gīveyya-* occurs in old texts (Ja IV 395,17\*, VI 590,9\*; *°eyyaka-*, V 297,14 [for further references cf. PED s.v. *gīveyyaka*]).

Freiburg i. Br.

Thomas Oberlies

## Literature

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Alsdorf 1928    | L. Alsdorf. Der Kumārapālpratibodha. Hamburg 1928 (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 2).  |
| Alsdorf 1935/37 | Id. The Vasudevahiṇḍi, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī. BSOS 8 (1935/37) 319-333 (= Kl. Sch. p. 56-70).                        |
| Alsdorf 1957    | Id. The story of Citta and Sambhūta. Felicitation Volume presented to S. K. Belvalkar. Benares 1957, 202-208 (= Kl. Sch. p. 186-192). |
| Alsdorf 1968    | Id. Die Āryā-Strophen des Pali-Kanons. Wiesbaden 1968 (AWLM 1967.4).  |
| Alsdorf 1977    | Id. Das Bhūridatta-Jātaka. WZKS 21 (1977) 25-55.  |

- Balbir 1989 N. Balbir. Morphological Evidence for Dialectal Variety in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. In: Dialectes dans les littératures Indo-Aryennes (ed. by C. Caillat). Paris 1989, 503-525.
- Bechert 1955 H. Bechert. Vokalkürzung vor Sandhikonsonant. MSS 6 (1955) 7-26.
- Bechert 1958 Id. Grammatisches aus dem Apadānabuch. ZDMG 108 (1958) 308-316.
- Berger 1955 H. Berger. Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre. München 1955.
- Berger 1957 Id. Bemerkungen zur Endung der 1. pl. präs. im Mittelindischen. MSS 11 (1957) 109-112.
- Bhayani 1953 H. C. Bhayani. Paumacariu of Kavirāja Svayambhūdeva. Part First. Bombay 1953.
- Bhayani / Shah 1987 H. C. Bhayani / R. M. Shah. Vasudevahiṇḍī Madhyama Khaṇḍa. Part I. Ahmedabad 1987.
- Bollée 1977 W. B. Bollée. Studien zum Sūyagaḍa. Wiesbaden 1977.
- Bollée 1995 W. B. Bollée. The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta: Āyāranga, Dasaveyāliya, Uttarajjhāyā and Sūyagaḍa. Stuttgart 1995.
- Chatterji 1983 S. K. Chatterji. On the Development of Middle Indo-Aryan. Calcutta 1983.
- Dschi 1949 Hiän-li Dschi. Die Verwendung des Aorists als Kriterium für Alter und Ursprung buddhistischer Texte. NAWG 1949, 245-301.

- Ghatage 1937 A. M. Ghatage. Instrumental and Locative in Ardha-Māgadhī. IHQ 13 (1937) 52-58.
- Ghatage 1941 Id. Introduction to Ardha-Māgadhī. Kolhapur 1941.
- Ghatage 1953 Id. A Locative Form in Paumacariya. Summaries of the All-India Oriental Conference 16 (1953) 116-117.
- Gonda 1957 J. Gonda. The Use of the Particle *ca*. Vāk 5 (1957) 1-73 (= Selected Studies I, 320-392).
- von Hinüber 1968 O. von Hinüber. Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinaya-Piṭaka. München 1968.
- von Hinüber 1983 Review of H. Bechert (ed.). Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. Göttingen 1980. IF 88 (1983) 307-312.
- von Hinüber 1986 Id. Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. Wien 1986 (cited as von Hinüber).
- Hoffmann 1975 K. Hoffmann. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 1. Wiesbaden 1975.
- Hoffmann 1976 Id. Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 2. Wiesbaden 1976.
- Hopkins 1903 E. W. Hopkins. Limitation of time by means of cases in Epic Sanskrit. AJP 24 (1903) 1-24.
- Insler 1994 St. Insler. Rhythmic Effects in Pali Morphology. Die Sprache 36 (1994) 70-93.
- Jacobi 1886 H. Jacobi. Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī. Leipzig 1886.
- Jacobi 1918 Id. Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhaṇavāla. München 1918.

- Katre 1937 S. M. Katre. Epic *iyāt* and Blends of Aorist and Optative Forms. JAOS 57 (1937) 316-317.
- Katre 1938 Id. Epic *iyāt*. NIA 1 (1938) 536.
- Katre 1939 Id. Apropos Epic *iyāt*. BDCRI 1 (1939) 8-13.
- Keith 1908 B. Keith. Review of J. Hertel. Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hemacandra's *Parīśiṣṭaparvan* (Leipzig 1908). JRAS 1908, 1191-1193.
- Keith 1920 Id. Rigveda Brāhmaṇas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda. London 1920 (Delhi 1981<sup>3</sup>).
- Kielhorn 1898 F. Kielhorn. The Jātakas and Sanskrit Grammarians. JRAS 1898, 17-21 (= Kl. Sch. p. 294-298).
- Kulkarni 1946 E. D. Kulkarni. Epic Variants. Case Variation in the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata. BDCRI 7 (1946) 1-219.
- Lévi 1925 S. Lévi. Ptolémée, le Niddesa et la Br̥hatkathā. PEFEO 22 (1925) 1-55.
- Lüders 1954 H. Lüders. Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons. Berlin 1954.
- Meenakshi 1983 K. Meenakshi. Epic Syntax. New Delhi 1983.
- Oberlies 1995 Th. Oberlies. Beiträge zur Pali-Lexikographie. IJ 38 (1995) 105-147.
- Oberlies 1995a Id. Die Wurzel *gad* im Mittelindischen. HS 108 (1995) 190-191.
- Oberlies 1996 Id. Stray remarks on Pali phonology, morphology, and vocabulary (Some addenda to Geiger's Pali grammar). MSS 1996 (forthcoming).

- Pathak 1969 R. A. Pathak. Some linguistic peculiarities in the Purāṇas. Purāṇa 11 (1969) 119-126.
- Pisani 1934 V. Pisani. Glosse marginali al *Mahābhārata*. Rivista degli Studi Orientali 15 (1934) 65-75.
- Pisani 1946 Id. On some peculiarities of the use of cases in the Ādiparvan. NIA 8 (1946) 187-190.
- Pisani 1952 Id. Noterelle Pāli. Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo dei scienze e lettere (Classe di lettere). 85 (1952) 279-288.
- Renou 1952 L. Renou. Grammaire de la langue védique. Lyon 1952.
- Sen 1958 S. Sen. History and pre-history of Sanskrit. Mysore 1958.
- Singh 1980 R. A. Singh. Syntax of Apabhraṃśa. Calcutta 1980.
- Smith 1950 H. Smith. Les deux prosodies du vers Bouddhique. Human. Vetenskapssamfundets i Lund Årsberättelse 1949-1950, I.
- Smith 1954 Id. Analecta rhythmica. Studia Orientalia (edita Societas Orientalis Fennica) XIX: 7 (1954) 3-17.
- Speijer 1886 J. S. Speijer. Sanskrit Syntax. Leiden 1886 (reprinted Delhi 1993).
- Speijer 1896 Id. Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax. Strassburg 1896 (Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I,6).
- Tedesco 1947 P. Tedesco. Sanskrit *pudgala* "body; soul". JAOS 67 (1947) 172-177.

- Thieme 1963 P. Thieme. *āścarya*-. ZvS 78 (1963) 104-111 (= Kl. Sch. p. 194-201).
- Upadhye 1943 A. N. Upadhye. *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Āchārya Hariṣena. Bombay 1943.
- Upadhye 1944 Id. The Dhūrtākhyāna: A Critical Study. In: Śrī Jina Vijaya Muni. *Dhūrtākhyāna* of Haribhadra Sūri. Bombay 1944, 1-56.
- Upadhye 1974 Id. Prabhācandra's Ārāghanā-Kathā-Prabandha or Kathākośa. New Delhi 1974 (Māṇikachandra D. Jaina Granthamālā No. 55).
- de Vreese 1955 K. de Vreese. Did Middle Indian know an abl. sg. m. n. in *-am*? BSOAS 17 (1955) 369-371.
- de Vreese 1953 Id. Dravidismen in het latere Pali. Handelingen van het Twintigste Vlaams Filologencongres. Antwerpen 1953, 96-99.
- de Vreese 1980 Id. Dravidian Idioms in Later Pali. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 11 (1980) 179-222.
- de Wijesekera 1993 O. H. de A. Wijesekera. *Syntax of the Cases in the Pāli Nikāyas*. Colombo 1993 (Thesis, University of London, 1936).

## The \*Paramatthajotikādīpanī, a Fragment of the Subcommentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta\*

Subcommentaries on texts of the Khuddakanikāya are known to have existed so far only from the evidence found in the Piṭakat samuñh<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, it came as a pleasant surprise, when a fragmentary manuscript copied as early as in CS 894 corresponding to 1532 A.D. came to light in the collection of Vat Lai Hin near Lampang in Northern Thailand<sup>2</sup>. The text of this fragment covers Pj II 513,16 on Sn 770 in the Kāmasutta of the Mahāvagga up to Pj II 548,29 on Sn 848, the first verse of the Purābheda-sutta of the Aṭṭhakavagga.

The cover leaves at the beginning and at the end of the single fascicle extant communicate only the title given erroneously as *tikā* (sic!) *suttanipāta āṅguttara* (!)<sup>3</sup> and the year without containing a complete colophon. Therefore the real title of this subcommentary can be inferred only from the titles given at the end of the single Suttas of the Suttanipāta such as Kāmasuttavaṇṇanādīpanī. Thus “Paramatthajotikādīpanī” is nothing more than a likely guess<sup>4</sup>.

\* The abbreviations used follow the system laid down in the Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

<sup>1</sup> On the Piṭ-sm cf. O.v.Hinüber: A Handbook of Pāli Literature. Berlin 1996 § 4. - The only exception is the Linatthappakāsini on the Jātaka, cf. *ibidem* § 261 and 359.

<sup>2</sup> This collection will be described in: O.v.Hinüber: Die Pāli-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand (under preparation), where this manuscript is listed as no. 63, see also JPTS 22.1996, p. 35-37.

<sup>3</sup> In spite of the fact that *su-* is clearly written, the scribe seems to have thought of the Sattakanipāta in the Āṅguttaranikāya.

<sup>4</sup> It is not impossible that the correct title is Paramatthasūdanī rather, if Ñānamoli: The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning (Paramatthajotikā) Part I. London 1960, p. V is correct in taking Ādiccavaṃsa's Paramatthasūdanī mentioned in Piṭ-sm to cover also Pj II, but cf. CPD (Epilegomena) 2.5.1,12 and 2.5.5,12.